REMARKS

By the foregoing Amendment, Claims 1, 3, and 9-11 have been amended. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, on the grounds of indefiniteness. Claims 1, 3 and 9-11 were rejected as to the recitation of "said system" and "the system" on the grounds of multiple antecedent basis. These phrases have now been deleted in Claims 1, 3 and 9, and Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to recite the "combination," so that the preambles of these claims more clearly relate to the combination claimed. It is therefore believed that the rejection of Claims 1, 3 and 9-11 on the grounds of indefiniteness can now be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3 and 9-11 were rejected on the grounds of obviousness from Henderson et al. in view of Baker et al. and Teo. The Examiner acknowledged that Henderson et al. does not disclose a video camera having a wide angle lens rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft. However, the Examiner indicated that Henderson et al. discloses a camera system mounted to the nose of an aircraft thereby providing a "lens system" that is rotatable about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft. The Examiner referred to Henderson et al. at column 5, lines 4-58, and column 7, lines 24-52. The Examiner also indicated that Henderson et al. at column 7, lines 24-39, teaches that a downward camera is mounted to the aircraft with a landscape camera lens that is rotatable about a mounting

axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, i.e. the horizontal line of sight.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "a video camera providing a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline," and "a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide said field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline." Claim 9 similarly has been amended to recite "a video camera mounted to the aircraft and providing a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline," and "a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide said field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline." Support for the amendments can be found in the specification at page 3, line 18-19, and Claim 1 as originally filed.

Henderson et al. at column 5, lines 4-58, and column 7, lines 24-52 discloses a compact sealed unit incorporating at least two cameras which are arranged to give both a vertical (landscape) and a longitudinal (forward looking) view from the aircraft. The two camera head units, including their lens assemblies, are secured by bracket assemblies that provide rotational and elevation adjustments for the camera head unit fields of view. The cameras are arranged so that when the module is installed in the nose section of an aircraft, one camera field of view is downward or perpendicular to the horizontal line of flight, and the other camera field of view is forward or coincidental to the line of flight.

Henderson et al. further teaches a prior art system that included a camera unit 2, illustrated in more detail in FIG. 2, included a pair of cameras 4, 6 arranged to view both vertically and longitudinally from within the housing 8 located within the structure 10 of a forward portion of the aircraft.

Henderson et al. does not teach, disclose or suggest a video camera providing a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and a plurality of separate video images, with the video camera mounted to the aircraft and having a wide angle lens rotatable about a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide the field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline, as is claimed.

As is discussed at column 7, lines 24-27, the camera system of Henderson et al. provides separate bracket assemblies for the two separate cameras for rotational and elevational adjustments of the individual camera heads fields of view, about two entirely different axes, and not about a mounting axis that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft, as is claimed. In the present invention, rotation of the wide angle lens of the video camera of the present invention about a mounting axis that is directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft allows orientation of the field of view of the lens of the video camera independently of the axial orientation of the aircraft, about the mounting axis JK that is directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline

and perpendicular to the tangent LM to the surface of the aircraft, which is not possible with the camera system of Henderson et al.

Baker et al. discloses hemispheric imaging, and Teo discloses compositing images, but it is respectfully submitted that Baker et al. and Teo also do not teach, disclose or suggest a video camera providing a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and a plurality of separate video images, with the video camera mounted to the aircraft and having a wide angle lens rotatable about a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide the field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline, as is claimed. It is respectfully submitted that even when taken in combination, the combined teachings of Henderson et al., Baker et al. and Teo do not teach, disclose or suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the combination of a closed circuit television mounted to an aircraft, comprising a video camera providing a field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and a plurality of separate video images, with the video camera mounted to the aircraft and having a wide angle lens rotatable about a mounting axis directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline and that is perpendicular to a tangent to the surface of the aircraft to provide the field of view directed forwardly and downwardly of the aircraft's centerline, as is claimed.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that Claims 1-3 and 9-11 are novel and inventive over Henderson et al., Baker et al. and Teo, taken individually or in combination, and that the rejection of Claims 1-3 and 9-11 should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application should now be in condition for allowance, and an early favorable action in this regard is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FULWIDER PATTON LLP

By: 

David G. Parkhurst
Reg. No. 29,422

DGP/rvw
Encls.: Return Postcard

Howard Hughes Center
6060 Center Drive, Tenth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90045
Telephone: (310) 824-5555
Facsimile: (310) 824-9696
Customer No. 24201